



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/754,411	01/02/2001	Eric D. Bergman	0007056-0053/P5278/ARG	3148
26263	7590	01/11/2006	EXAMINER	
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP			HUYNH, CONG LAC T	
P.O. BOX 061080			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER				
CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080			2178	

DATE MAILED: 01/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/754,411	BERGMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Cong-Lac Huynh	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 10/17/05 to the application filed on 1/2/01.
2. Claims 25-27 are added.
3. Claims 1-27 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 9, 17 are independent claims.
4. The rejections of claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manning in view of Keskar have been withdrawn in view of Applicants' arguments.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 25 is objected to since the dependency is not proper. Claim 25 is dependent on claim 1, but the feature "utilizing change tracking software" is not included in claim 1.
6. Claim 27 is objected to since the dependency is not proper. Claim 27 is dependent on claim 17, but the feature "utilizing change tracking software" is not included in claim 17.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rybicki et al. (US Pat No. 5,630,081, 5/13/97, filed 9/7/95) in view of Kucala (US Pat No. 5,832,489, 11/3/98, filed 10/8/97, priority 10/18/95).

Regarding independent claim 1, Rybicki discloses:

- creating an original document on a computer (**col 1, lines 15-25**: the fact that portable computers known as laptop, notebook, or palmtop PC allow the traveler to continue working while on the road or on the plane as in his/her office inherently shows that the original documents are created at the desktop computer at his/her office)
- transferring said original document to a disconnected device, wherein said disconnected device is a portable electronic device capable of performing computations at any location (**col 1, lines 15-25**: the fact that portable computers

known as laptop, notebook, or palmtop PC allow the traveler to continue working while on the road or on the plane as in his/her office inherently shows that the original documents are transferred to his/her portable computer, which is a disconnected device capable of performing computations at any location)

- modifying said original document on said disconnected device to form a modified document (**col 1, lines 15-25**: files on the portable PC are modified)
- returning said modified document to said computer (**col 1, lines 15-25**: modified files on the portable PC are transferred to the desktop computer when said traveler returns to his/her office)

Rybicki does not disclose:

- determining one or more modification between said original document and said modified document

Kucala discloses:

- determining one or more modification between said original document and said modified document (col 4, lines 1-20)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Kucala into Rybicki since Kucala discloses determining one modification between the original document and the modified document providing the advantage to incorporate into Rybicki for easily adding the documents modified in the portable device to the original document in the desktop computer upon a user desire.

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Rybicki does not disclose utilizing change tracking software.

Kucala discloses utilizing change tracking software (table 1, col 4, lines 1-20: determining new, updated or deleted records as well as using the comparing result to create a single file that contains all new records, modified records, and unmodified records imply that a change tracking software is utilized).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Kucala into Rybicki for easily differentiating changes made to the files in the portable PC before synchronizing with the files in the desktop computer.

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Rybicki does not disclose utilizing a data translation operation.

Kucala discloses utilizing a data translation operation (col 5, lines 39-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Kucala into Rybicki since the data translation in Kucala would provide the advantage to incorporate into Rybicki to allow information to be synchronized between the palmtop and PC applications that use different systems and file formats.

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Rybicki and Kucala disclose that

said disconnected device comprises a PDA (Rybicki: col 1, lines 15-25; Kucala: figure 1).

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Rybicki does not disclose determining whether to integrate said modification into said original document. Kucala discloses determining whether to integrate said modification into said original document (col 1, lines 49-62, col 3, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Kucala into Rybicki since Kucala discloses determining whether to integrate the modification into the original document providing the advantage to incorporate into Rybicki for effectively synchronizing files between the handheld computer and the desktop computer.

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Rybicki does not disclose merging said original document and said modified document.

Kucala discloses merging said original document and said modified document (col 3, lines 22-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Kucala into Rybicki since Kucala discloses merging the original document and the modified document providing the advantage to incorporate into Rybicki for obtaining the new version of a document at a desktop computer after being modified in part remotely from a portable device.

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Rybicki discloses said original document was created using an office productivity application (col 1, lines 15-25: files created in the offices implies using an office productivity application).

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Rybicki discloses said document was modified using a companion application (col 1, lines 15-25: modify a file at the portable PC implies using a companion application).

Claims 9-12, 13-16 are for a change tracker of method claims 1-4, 5-8, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 17-20, 21-24 are for a computer program product of method claims 1-4, 5-8, and are rejected under the same rationale.

10. Claims 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rybicki et al. (US Pat No. 5,630,081, 5/13/97, filed 9/7/95) in view of Kucala (US Pat No. 5,832,489, 11/3/98, filed 10/8/97, priority 10/18/95).

Regarding claim 25, which is dependent on claim 1, Rybicki does not disclose identifying the differences between the original document and said modified document and storing difference information to indicate the identified differences.

Kucala discloses identifying the differences between the original document and said modified document and storing difference information to indicate the identified differences (col 4, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Kucala into Rybicki since identifying said differences and storing said differences would help to determine whether or not to merge the files of the portable PC and the desktop PC.

Claims 26 and 27 are for a system and a computer program product of method claim 25, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicants argue that Manning and Keskat do not teach or suggest returning a modified document to a computer (Remarks, page 8).

Examiner agrees.

Rybicki discloses the argued feature. See the rejection above.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Hawkins et al. (US Pat No. 6,000,000, 12/7/99, priority 10/13/95).

Pajakowski et al. (US Pat No. 6,718,425, 4/6/04, filed 5/31/00).

Chase, Jr. (US Pat No. 5,974,238, 10/26/99, filed 8/7/96).

Kucala (US Pat App Pub No. 2001/0016853, 8/23/01, priority 8/12/98).

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-4125. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Cong-Lac Huynh
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2178
01/05/06